

Oak Street
UNCLASSIFIED

ANNUAL COMMUNICATION
OF THE
PRESIDENT
TO THE
UNIVERSITY FACULTY

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1926

THE LIBRARY OF THE

MAY 12 1927

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLUMBUS

20. 8. 13

TO MEMBERS OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL FORCE:

For thirty years this University has been organized into colleges and in that time their number has increased from six to ten, and for half that time there has been an organized Graduate School. The number of students in this period has grown from 1000 to 12,000 and the teaching force from 75 to about 750, and meanwhile the number of departments has grown from 33 to 61. The number of students on the Campus today is 9300 and of this number practically one-third are freshmen and about one-third are women.

Thinking now of our organization, it is seen that these colleges are not entirely separate entities, for there are departments in a number of colleges which minister to the needs also of other colleges, and may, therefore, be called general-service departments. Such service is rendered especially in the first and second years of the students' life at the University. Little, if any, general service work is done in the last two years of the college course. Each college is organized with its own Faculty; and here again the lines of college activities cross each other and a professor may properly be a member of several college Faculties, depending upon his field of teaching. The college Faculties are in most cases, therefore, somewhat of a composite body, but the questions upon which they act are largely those growing out of the situation or the necessity or the hope of the particular college. Above all is the University Faculty composed almost entirely of those of professorial rank and numbering about 150. The departments are allocated among the colleges largely for budgeting purposes.

Of the ten colleges now on the Campus, seven receive freshmen and carry the work through the four normal college years. The other three are strictly professional and take the students after one or two years of study in another college. These three colleges, however, account for fewer than 900 students, and their interest in many University policies is in about the same proportion as their number of students is to the entire student body. Questions relating to the colleges generally come up for consideration in the College Faculty and practically all questions relating to students, their courses of study, the methods of teaching, and the experiences of the students with their work, are for discussion and rather final disposition by the College Faculty. When a subject is brought to the University Faculty upon the proposal of a College Faculty, the tendency on the part of the University Faculty is to take the viewpoint of the particular college, and approve its action, usually without much, if any, debate. The rather general feeling among University Faculty members is that each college is organized to take care of its own affairs and has given them more attention than could be given by the members of other College Faculties, and therefore usually whatever a particular college may propose for its own purposes will be sanctioned. A great many questions have been settled on the floor of the University Faculty on the principle that if a particular college wants a certain thing and feels that it is in accordance with its policies and its purposes, then such college should be privileged to have its way. The history of the past three decades will, therefore, doubtless show that more and more the University tends to become ten colleges with no large degree of homogene-

ity or of common interest except as such interest grows out of the relations mentioned. Each college tends more and more to the viewpoint that its chief business is to do its own curricular work well and feels a keen responsibility for the discharge of that pleasure and obligation in the traditional way. The student bodies of the several colleges also tend more and more to flow apart and to think of themselves as members of a particular college rather than as students of a great University. The net result is that no great degree of union or coherence is apparent in our University organization, and that fact tends to aggravate some of the conditions about which, with the kind permission of the Faculty, I should like to speak briefly.

There are many matters of great importance which are insistently pressing for hearing, some of these developed by the educational survey which has been in progress for the past year; some rendered acute by the rumored attitude of the legislators here and there toward State Universities, prompted by the consideration of the very large and constantly increasing revenues required for University maintenance; and other questions there are which perennially appear for deliberation. It might also be suggested that the character of much of the teaching in a University such as ours needs greater attention than we have up to the present time been able to give to it; that matter somehow has ordinarily taken care of itself, and there has been much lack of appraisalment in the University, as distinguished from the rather careful supervision attempted of the teaching rendered in the public-school system. Further, the matter of student failures in their college work, their successes, migrations, and other experiences, about these things we occasionally

see an array of statistics, but ordinarily that fails to lead to consideration of the subject and action. Whether the student is to blame, or the teaching, or both, or whether the student is pursuing the wrong field of study, or whether there is any method of preventing the vast waste in student life and resources and in state money, or whether the University owes to its students, especially the freshmen, a different system of dealing with them before entrance and after—all these are general matters relating to the educational process which are pressing for attention and for the united thought and wisdom of the University Faculty. Any of these questions is large enough and important enough to attract attention. But today at your pleasure I should like to think with the members of this Faculty with whom I have had most delightful associations for the past 24 years, of the freshmen students. This is a matter which directly affects seven of our colleges, and indirectly but nevertheless quite materially, the three strictly professional colleges. About one-third of our student body is composed of the freshmen; they come here ordinarily from the high schools of the state, and for the great majority it is their first experience away from home. They are inexperienced in college life; they have never before met such a wealth of courses of study from which they are required in their wisdom to make selections, they are unfamiliar with the methods of teaching employed in some lines of work, and also with the methods of study generally required. The fact that they are here is in most cases warrant for the belief that they are here with an eagerness about the work and are hopeful and expectant, and really believe they are engaged in a great venture. They are therefore in a position to

call for sympathy and patience and a determined effort to understand them and their viewpoints and their needs. There is no mistaking the fact that the work of the college teacher calls for a very large expression of his human interest in dealing with these freshmen. So far as possible these young people should receive the most intelligent attention and the most accomplished expression of the teacher's art; so far as possible they should fall into the hands only of experienced, patient, and sympathetic teachers, who will understand that for the most part they are still children, amenable to guidance and inspiration, and that in many cases they are diamonds in the rough and the polishing process for many of them may be rather slow. Perhaps this is the attitude taken by most teachers, but yet from a number of quarters the remark is heard that the teaching received by the freshmen in a State University should be subjected to investigation and appraisal. Of such great importance is a freshman in a University that many careful studies have been made in recent years of his fate in college work, and there have been much constructive thought and writing about him; and because of developments found in his college life the investigation has been directed to his high-school career and his home life, for the purpose of finding the setting for his college experiences. This freshman problem is the most fundamental question which University educators are facing today.

Our brief study of the freshman will fall into three periods: *one*, up to the time of registration and including registration; *two*, covering his experiences in his first year in the University; and *three*, various proposals made for improvement. The University

is not responsible for the freshman as he is at registration, but must assume some responsibility for his experiences during his first year here. His educational experience before coming to the University will depend much upon the character of his high-school courses of study. Professor Counts of Yale University has recently published a study of high-school curricula, based upon the high-school work offered in a dozen of the large cities of the country selected with great care as to geographical location, and he comes to the conclusion that these curricula are in a state of constant change; nobody is satisfied with them and no one is entirely pleased with all of the changes recommended, and there is a state of mind bordering on general confusion about what the high-school curriculum should include and what it should exclude. This is partly, perhaps entirely, due to the varying conceptions of the purposes of the high school. As these change, clamors arise for changes in the curricula and these changes may or may not come about, dependent upon the influence back of the demand. It cannot be said that high-school curricula are as yet standardized, and it may be that they should not become standardized. But it would appear that the people interested in promoting and outlining public education should by this time have come to some general agreement as to the quality of a large number of subjects of study which are presented for the high-school students. This variety of training and requirement in high schools is necessarily reflected in the students coming to the University, and this condition is probably the same in Ohio as in the various cities outside of Ohio studied by Professor Counts. The same thought with reference to the secondary-school educa-

tion in the United States and its failure in a large way to prepare for effective higher education is given thorough discussion by President Pritchett in the Twentieth Annual Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Secondary education in America is there shown to lack the continuity, the knowledge of relationships, and the mental fiber which comes from a long sustained effort. He compares secondary education here with that in Germany, France, and England, and finds generally the European training results in intellectual power and ability to go forward, and a grasp upon intellectual processes surprisingly lacking here. It is clearly shown that one of our great troubles in the secondary school is that we are carrying on mass education without the ability up to the present time to organize successful educational processes to deal with the situation. He finds also that a considerable part of the high-school population in America cannot profit by high-school training, whereas in Europe progressively rigid elimination of the unworthy is practiced.

Further, in Ohio by legislative enactment, all graduates of first-grade high schools are *ipso facto* to be admitted to the Ohio State University; therefore the University has practically no choice in the selection of its freshman group. However, the requirements for admission to our colleges contain limitations upon the right of the high-school graduate to enter, and conditions are imposed upon many of those who do enter. A few facts concerning these conditioned freshmen will be interesting; a study covering the year 1925 shows that out of 234 freshmen admitted to the College of Agriculture, 32 came in with conditions; out of the 912 in the College of Arts, 53 had condi-

tions; out of the 530 in the College of Commerce and Journalism, 58 were conditioned; out of 345 in the College of Education, 44 came in with conditions; out of 450 in the College of Engineering, 189 came in with conditions, and in the College of Pharmacy, seven out of 62 were conditioned. Otherwise stated, and it will be understood that the same student may have had more than one condition, by totaling the figures for the seven colleges, it appears that in Algebra, 109 were conditioned; in Plane Geometry, 198; in Science, 14; in American History, 3; Civil Government, 2; Solid Geometry, 100; Physics, 57; in Foreign Languages, 89; making a total of 572 conditions distributed among 383 students. Out of this 572, 335 were found in the College of Engineering alone. The duty of removing these conditions is promptly added to the other duty of carrying the appropriate work for the freshman year; roughly speaking, therefore, the freshman who enters with conditions starts with an overload and is required to do that much more work than the freshman who enters without. Hence he who can do least in this case usually is required to do most, and the result is discouraging. The general requirement is to remove these conditions before the opening of the Fourth Quarter, and in some cases the requirement is that the particular conditions must be removed in an earlier Quarter.

Many high-school principals in making up the record of students for transmission to the University indicate whether the student was in the upper, or middle, or lower third of the class, and this information is sometimes derived from other sources. Such information is valuable but it is not supplemented by an effort to inquire into the student's home life nor to become in

any way acquainted with him before he enters the University, and, therefore, there is no method of advising him or his parents whether he will probably profit by his college experience. In our practice, the freshman ordinarily registers by mail, and first appears on the Campus at the time required to make payment of fees. He will have slight, if any, knowledge of the Campus, or the University, or the College into which he goes, and will on the whole be in new and strange surroundings and face to face with new experiences without any particular attempt on our part to introduce him properly. In making up his schedule of work for the Autumn Quarter he acquires information and suggestions and advice from cards and booklets and printed blanks sent to him in a ponderous envelope, all of which he is told to study carefully before making his choices. In several of the colleges of the University he faces a rather bewildering array of subjects, among which he is expected to make wise decisions and present a program of study founded upon his well-reasoned needs. True, he has much guidance, but its necessary detail is baffling, and the schedule of courses submitted by the average freshman is largely a guess. But he is committed to this guess rather strictly for the Quarter and in many cases doubtless it turns out well and in many it turns out badly.

When the election card has been returned to the Registrar's office, he is arbitrarily grouped into sections and assigned to certain hours of the day, and so the class schedule is completed. The freshman takes his physical examination and the psychological examination or intelligence test, and then waits for regular recitations to begin. His first meeting with instruc-

tors and fellow freshmen takes place in the classroom, and for the most part the recitation work thus begun goes on in the fashion with which we are well acquainted.

In some of the colleges the Deans through the Quarter will give an hour a week to a lecture to the freshmen in the particular college to "orient" them in the work there, and to put them in position to know more of the nature of the courses offered and the opportunities to be reasonably expected from pursuing one or another of the curricula maintained there. Much information, especially about the general University regulations relating to the freshmen, is also imparted in these lectures. It is virtually an added course on the subject of the freshman in their relation to their own college and to the University.

And now it is interesting to follow the scholastic experiences of our freshmen from Quarter to Quarter through the year. Careful studies have been made of the freshmen in the College of Arts in this University by S. M. Whinery, Secretary of that College, for the year 1925-1926, with the purpose of ascertaining what scholastic standing measured by our system of marking, the students reached; 896 freshmen were studied, 102 of whom received marks for only the first Quarter, and then left; 186 for the first two Quarters, and 608 for all three Quarters; consequently about 11 per cent dropped out in their first or Autumn Quarter; 21 per cent more in the Winter Quarter, and 68 per cent were left at the end of the year when the final examinations came on. Over one-third had a point average of less than 1.5, between D and C, 43 per cent had an average under the magic 1.7, and 46 per cent were below 1.8, the average for graduation.

These results seem to indicate that many students ought not to have come at all, or that the University was at fault in its educational methods, or that a mistake was made in choosing the work.

A study of the freshmen has been made for this University for the year 1924-1925, by H. A. Edgerton, presented in the form of a thesis for the M.A. degree in June, 1926. He considers the freshmen of the five larger colleges, Agriculture, Arts, Commerce and Journalism, Education, and Engineering. His study deals with the value of the intelligence test as a guide to the elimination of freshmen, and as a basis for forecasting his scholastic attainment as measured by his point average. In other words, he tries to answer two questions: (1) How many freshmen will drop or be dropped from these five colleges in each of the quarters, and (2) how many freshmen will be able to make the various point averages under our marking system for each of the quarters? He studies only the native-born freshmen, so as to escape the language difficulty for foreign born in taking the intelligence tests, and finds in the Autumn Quarter, 1924, that 197 such freshmen entered the College of Agriculture; 733 the College of Arts; 477 the College of Commerce and Journalism; 232 the College of Education, and 372 the College of Engineering, a total of 2011. He chooses the per cent method of dealing with his data. His study reveals many interesting things relating to the journey of the freshman through the educational ways of a big University, but I shall stop long enough to mention only some of his results. Thinking of these 2011 persons only as University students, and with no reference to the colleges, he distributes them into nine groups in a descending scale on the basis of their in-

telligence rating, and finds between 200 and 300 in each of the upper eight and 99 in the bottom group. He finds that of the 218 in the top group, one drops out in the Autumn Quarter, 13 in the Winter, and 32 in the Spring, ending the year with 172 top-end students; 49 of the next to the top group drop out during the year; 63 of the next, 45 of the next, 65 of the next, 50 of the next, 86 of the next, 88 of the next, and 62 of the lowest. Or, otherwise stated, 51 drop out during the Autumn Quarter, 227 during the Winter Quarter, 276 during the Spring, a total of 554 who are gone when the Spring Quarter finals begin. This means that $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent go out during the first quarter, 11.3 per cent at the end of the first or during the second, and 13.7 per cent at the end of the second or during the third Quarter, a total of 27.5 per cent, leaving 1457 to take the Spring Quarter finals.

Note now the performance of the groups in point averages. Of the top group 172 are left and 95 per cent of them receive 1.8 and up; of the next, 183 are left and 85 per cent receive 1.8 and up; of the next lower, 230 are left and 75 per cent rate 1.8 and up; of the next lower 165 are left and 68 per cent are in the magic class; 172 of the next remain and 60 per cent are found at 1.8 and up; 161 are left in the next lower and 52 per cent are at 1.8 and above; 178 are left in the next lower and 42 per cent are at 1.8 and up; 159 are left in the next lower group and 35 per cent are at 1.8 and up; in the lowest 5 per cent, 37 are left and 35 per cent are at 1.8 and up; as we descend the scale the percentage of good students diminishes.

Of the 1457 left to weather the Spring Quarter finals, 60 receive a point average below D; 460 are below 1.7; 526 are below the graduation minimum,

1.8, that is, 36 per cent. Of these 1457 remaining, 931 are above 1.8, that is, making an average which, if maintained, will graduate them; this is *64 per cent* of all still in college, but only *46 per cent* of the number who started. Of the number remaining who make 1.7 and up and hence will reach the senior year if they maintain the standard, there are 68 per cent, that is about 50 per cent of all who entered.

Summarily stated, of 2011 freshmen, 1960 are left at the end of the First Quarter, 1733 at the end of the Second, and 1457 at the end of the Third Quarter, and nearly a third of this number will fail to reach 1.7 average. Therefore, less than 50 per cent of our freshman intake will ever be *successful* sophomores, and the chances are that less than 60 per cent will ever be sophomores at all, and the sole reason why these 10 per cent may come back is the operation of our probation and dismissal rules.

Edgerton's study covers also the history of these 2011 freshmen by colleges, but that will not be entered upon here. He makes some suggestive conclusions: In the highest 10 per cent of intelligence-test scores, chances are 79 to 100 that the student will not be eliminated during the first year; if not, chances are 9 in 10 of doing 1.8 work, and 3 in 5 of averaging above B. In the lowest 10 per cent of intelligence-test scores, chances are 55 in 100 of being eliminated before the end of the First Quarter, if not, chances are only 2 in 5 of reaching 1.8 grade of work, but no chance, however, of doing B work. And on the basis of his comprehensive study, he presents a program of exclusion from the University of the lowest 10 percentiles, and certain discriminating treatment of those who rank in the next 10 percentiles. With these conclusions Pro-

fessors Arps, Burt, and Toops are in substantial accord in their preliminary report to the President on the *advisability of fixing a certain grade in the intelligence test as a minimum for entrance to the University.*

Turning now to other studies, we find the Minnesota University study of student mortality; it considers all students over a period of several years, with a striking progressive loss all the way; these studies will bear the most careful consideration. The tragedy of the freshman is further portrayed by H. E. Stone, Dean of Men of the University of West Virginia, in the American School Board Journal for May, 1926, and by the remarkable report issuing from a committee of undergraduates of the University of Oregon in May, 1926, paying their respects to the freshman in Part III, covering about one-fourth of the whole report. Further, our own statistics show, for the Autumn and Winter Quarters of 1925-1926, a disturbing total of students, well over 2000 in each quarter, largely freshmen, whose work was more or less unsatisfactory, and about 900 who were already on probation or worse at the end of the Autumn Quarter.

The facts about the fate of the freshman seem to be much the same in the various State Universities, and reveal a startling condition of vast waste of student time, of teaching power, and of public money, and an ever increasing number of disappointed and discouraged young people, of saddened parents, and of bitter critics of the State system of higher education. With all these facts you are doubtless quite familiar; in their presence, what have the Universities been doing to understand and improve the conditions?

It has *been proposed*, and by some Universities has been attempted, to send members of the Faculty to the

larger communities of the State to visit high schools and homes, and give counsel by interviews or talks, or otherwise, concerning the University and its methods, and the qualities needed to reap the benefit of its training. The purpose is to bring the University to the people and the schools, to their mutual understanding, and clear away some of the illusions about the universal ability to profit by University study, as well as to give encouragement to those who seem mentally and morally fitted for higher education. This purpose of putting the working University into touch with the schools and parents is furthered also by giving high-school pupils in the senior class the intelligence tests submitted by the University; on the basis of these tests *also*, pupils and parents are advised as to the wisdom of University study in any particular case. If the pupil's school record supplements the intelligence test, a very conclusive basis is furnished for advice. These visitations and tests and conferences enable the parents and pupils better to visualize the University; and supply the human touch, so necessary where advice is given and careers urged or discouraged.

Minnesota University for several years has been giving the tests and following them up with letters of advice and interviews in a few large centers of population, and Michigan has under way definite plans for visiting schools and parents. The latter plan calls for much thought in development and personnel, and is, of course, expensive.

A *second proposal* for the improvement of our present system is what is called Freshman Week. A report on this subject presented by a Faculty Committee last spring is in your hands and is awaiting Faculty attention. This plan has come into widespread favor and is

being tried with variations in many institutions. This plan in operation meets the freshmen at the gate, a kind of "first-aid" treatment, and is a fine supplement to the visits and tests previously experienced.

A *third proposal* is to give "placement" examinations in the freshmen courses to ascertain what knowledge of the subject he brings with him, and what aptitude for the various fields of study he may have; a basis is thus afforded for guiding him in his future study, and to some extent in the immediate selection of the subjects to be studied. At *this point* the choice of courses should be made and passed on to the Registrar for schedule-making purposes.

It is *finally proposed* that the first two meetings of the class in each freshman subject should be devoted to examinations to ascertain ability, on the basis of which the students in a course will be distributed into graded sections, and afterwards as the work proceeds, through easy transfers up or down, a student will be precipitated to his normal level.

These *four proposals* will operate upon the freshman before the real study has begun, and if put into use they would go far to reduce the strait-jacket mechanism and formalism in dealing with young people with which this era of crowded colleges threatens to throttle higher education.

They are in operation wholly or partly in many places, including this University in some departments, but they have been advocated most appealingly by Dean Seashore of Iowa; he speaks of them as "adjustments" which should be experienced by the freshman, and summarizes them in this way:

(1) Rating and guidance through the qualifying examination at home, (and the personal visits by Faculty members);

(2) Orientation with Faculty and college environment in the "Freshman Week";

(3) The diagnosis by the departmental placement examinations, and

(4) Sectioning on the basis of ability.

These "adjustments" have been tried, and are in use in some colleges, and the interest in them is spreading fast. The experience at the University of Michigan with sectioning on the basis of ability is highly suggestive; there Professor Miller of the Department of Mechanism and Engineering Drawing carried on a careful study by experimenting with sections for two years, and his report to the University Senate is of great interest to every college teacher. Experiments along all these lines are planned or in progress at Wisconsin, Michigan, Iowa, Western Reserve, and many other Universities.

It is *further proposed* that State Universities should select their incoming students on the basis of ability and aptitude and should rigidly exclude, and thereby limit attendance to those who are worthy. Other Universities may select, but a number of State Universities, Ohio among them, cannot exclude graduates of first-grade high schools, and these schools are under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Education. A statute requires this University to admit such students, but it may and does attach conditions to their entrance, and many unhappy experiences begin at that point.

It is *now being seriously urged* that this statute should be repealed and all admissions should hereafter be based upon an educational examination, or upon a selection of the upper portion of the high-school class, or upon an intelligence test, or upon a combination of

two or more of these plans. This matter is on its way to the next Legislature in Ohio and the moving cause is the great cost of education at these higher institutions supported by the State. The long line of disasters, especially among freshmen, is suggesting that much public money is being wasted and consequently entrance to the State University should be now limited to persons whose ability has been demonstrated in some ways other than by high-school graduation. Clearly this movement is questioning the quality of the secondary-school work and standards, and is raising some discomfoting questions about University efficiency also, and will doubtless cause a very spirited discussion.

It is *further being said* that the student is not alone responsible for the many disheartening educational experiences he meets in college; some of the responsibility is upon him, it is said, but some also must fall upon the University, and accordingly the belief is expressed that the teaching of freshmen is not what it should be in quantity or quality. Lack of funds is the first answer generally heard, and that will explain why there are classes of 50 to 100 where the best Faculty judgment advises 25 or thereabouts. In the face of numbers expedients of various kinds have been and are now being tried with various degrees of success, and involving most serious questions of pedagogical theory and practice.

But aside from financial restrictions, the quality of the teaching is being called in question; we are engaged in "mass" education, and the individual gets smaller in a lengthening perspective, and the "human" touch, which is the vitalizing element in all teaching, wanes sadly. Many a freshman has felt bitterly that

he was only a cog in a big gear and that frequently the gear became an idler, and that the whole institution was mechanical. The cry to improve the teaching is insistent and the quality of much of the teaching in Universities is distinctly under investigation in the general appraisal of higher education now going on.

The *charge is also made* that the State Universities have gone so fast and on so large a scale into the graduate field that both money and teaching power required below and at the entrance to the University have been deflected into these higher regions, to the great benefit of teachers and students on these upper levels, to be sure, but to the disadvantage of the freshmen. It has therefore been suggested that the study of the freshmen necessarily involves, in our normal condition of inadequate finances, a study of the graduate offerings—in other words, the bottom and the top are intimately related through the nexus of public funds. This attack also concerns itself with the very numerous courses presented, upwards of 2000 in the largest State Universities.

Finally it is said that much of the human wreckage of a State University is due to its organization and its methods and its conception of the term "education," and this matter is closely connected with the foregoing statements about the lower and upper grades of University work.

For a considerable period of time, but with greater emphasis in recent years, the charge has been made that many persons receiving a diploma from State and some other Universities cannot properly be called educated people, and in the State Universities especially the organization has encouraged separate colleges, each

of them built from the ground up and each of them introducing and stressing peculiar curricula conducting the student through prescribed fields of training to designated degrees. Specifically it has been urged many times that in some of these colleges little or no attention has been paid to what might be called the humanizing or broadly cultural fields of learning, and especially that field popularly designated today as the "social sciences" has been practically neglected in some of the colleges of the State Universities.

The argument is being advanced that the Colleges of Law, Dentistry, Medicine, Agriculture, Engineering, Commerce, Education, Veterinary Medicine, and Pharmacy, are alike professional schools, and it is being urged in many quarters that all of them should require previous college study of the students whom they admit. Possibly a very important educational principle is involved in this discussion, but I am mentioning it here for the reason that the college organization may influence the fate of the freshman, and the question which has been raised the country over is whether there is anything in the organization of these colleges which tends to deprive the freshman of the opportunity he should have to orient himself in his college work and to obtain some experience in college study before committing himself to the choice of a particular line of education. It is widely urged as a matter for very careful and serious investigation whether a freshman coming into a State University should not pursue for one or two years studies of a more general nature than those found in these somewhat professional colleges, such studies as the "social sciences," some biological and some nonbiological science, and mathematics; the reasons advanced are that this whole period of train-

ing should be utilized to give the student an outlook on the field of learning, to equip him in some degree to make a rational choice of the field in which he desires his life work to lie, and to give him some of the information and training and educational interests which should form a part of the equipment of everyone who will be called upon to assume the duties of citizenship in addition to the business of making a living.

This line of thought naturally leads to a study of what is ordinarily termed the "Junior College," many of which have, in recent years, come into existence in various parts of this country, and some of which are supported at State expense, notably in California. It is argued that so long as the secondary schools supported by the public carry students of eighteen years of age no further than they do at present, an intermediate collegiate institution is necessary in order to give the further training which a student should have before he embarks on the study of one of the professions. The argument is that all of these professions are clearly to be placed on the same basis and that the same degree of preliminary collegiate study is necessary in order to enable the student to come out properly equipped for life in a country such as this where all public affairs are in the hands of the citizens.

At this point it is evident that this matter of organization of the University is vitally connected with the problem of the freshman and likewise the problem of the Graduate School, and a study of one of these elements cannot be entirely comprehensive unless it includes a relating study of the other elements. That this matter of the Junior College is of pressing importance is shown by the three volumes in which Professor Koos of the University of Minnesota has written

about the subject, and also incidentally by the interest just now displayed by Western Reserve University in the subject. That University will observe its 100th anniversary next month, and one of the conferences to be held on that occasion is to be devoted to a symposium on the Junior College and its connection with the University, and only last Saturday, President Vinson stated that he had already been given 300 acres of land and had a fine prospect for funds to erect and equip college buildings; the entire plant there to be devoted to a Junior College for three or four hundred students and to be provided with a teaching staff quite distinct and separate from that of the University itself. And in this same connection the reported experiment to be carried on at the University of Wisconsin this year under the direction of Professor Meiklejohn is of great interest also.

In reference to this one- or two-year college in which the student will receive general training specialized sufficiently to enable him afterwards to enter some one of the professional schools, it is suggested that there be set up a number of curricula so that a student who tires or reaches his capacity or is unable to continue to the end, may equip himself for a vocation, or may so have rounded out his study as to qualify him to take up one or another line of activity for a livelihood or for further study on the outside.

Educators for some time have been coming to the conclusion that the first two years of a student's college studies should be more carefully selected and prescribed and supervised than is desirable for the succeeding years, and this theory lies at the foundation of the educational plan carried out for a few years now at Princeton University and looked upon with favor

at Dartmouth and Harvard and some other institutions. In fact, the foremost educational thought seems to have reached the conclusion that the method of study and the freedom of the student and the responsibility for accomplishment placed upon him should be of a developing and growing nature, and in the last years of his college course he should have much greater liberty and responsibility than he is given in the first two; that is, the first two years of college study are preliminary and are fundamental both for subject matter and for method.

It is interesting to note that the undergraduate committee at the University of Oregon which made a rather remarkable report last May, advocated different treatment for the freshman in a separate organization for teaching and college work, prompted by this same theory just mentioned. This idea was also strongly stressed by President Little upon his inauguration at the University of Michigan a year ago. And so the continuous agitation of this thought that the first two years of college should be built upon studies liberally featured with cultural courses, and the rapid growth of the Junior College, and the growing conviction that the rigid professional training given to students beginning with the freshman year and continued through four years, results in an educational training which is largely vocational without the necessary cultural setting to fit one also for the duties of citizenship, all these considerations indicate that the present is a proper time for further appraisalment of our University organization.

In this sketchy fashion and with your kind forbearance, I have set forth the most pressing problem of the Universities today—the problem of the fresh-

men! It is vital from every standpoint! Never again will the mind of the student be so open, so earnest, so conscientious, so pliable for good or ill, as at the freshman age. The responsibility resting upon the University for his future is almost overwhelming. That responsibility has not been successfully or satisfactorily carried by the State Universities, and this decade of mass education has emphasized our failures without yet evolving a remedy. Faculties everywhere are seeking a way out and have been carrying the investigation into the homes, the high schools, the dealings they should have with the student before he begins class work, his experiences as a student, the character of the teaching he gets, the nature of the courses prescribed or elected, the wisdom of permitting him to make elections, the wisdom of permitting him to go forward to a University degree without a liberal training in cultural and humanitarian studies, the organization of the educational machinery so that a definite and logical break comes at the end of the second year—all these matters are insistently calling for thought and determination.

This is the beginning of the Golden Age of University History; we recognize our failures, we appreciate our inadequacy to the task present-day civilization places upon us; we hold nothing sacred from appraisement and evaluation, and we are willing to experiment and change. The situation is everywhere under study and a mass of data has been accumulated. If the thought and wisdom of this Faculty can now be concentrated upon a solution of the freshman problem in this University, the entire machinery and methods will feel the beneficial effect of their conclusions, and

the University of tomorrow will be not only much different, but much better.

GEORGE W. RIGHTMIRE.

October 14, 1926.

THE LIBRARY OF 'F'

MAY 12 1927

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS



3 0112 105794561